



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/656,531	09/07/2000	Tim Armandpour	P3929	2317
24739	7590	03/22/2006	EXAMINER	
CENTRAL COAST PATENT AGENCY PO BOX 187 AROMAS, CA 95004			BASEHOAR, ADAM L	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		2178		
DATE MAILED: 03/22/2006				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/656,531	ARMANDPOUR ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Adam L. Basehoar	2178	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 January 2006.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-86 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 29-86 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-28 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) 29-86 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: The RCE filed 01/06/06.
2. Claims 29-86 have been added as necessitated by Amendment.
3. Claims 1-2 and 12-28 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Weinberg et al (US-6,360,332 03/19/02).
4. Claims 3-11 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Weinberg et al (US-6,360,332 03/19/02) in view of W3C's, "HTML 4.0 Specification," 04/24/98, <http://www.w3.org/TR/1998/REC-html40-19980424/>, pp. 1-27 (Hereafter W3C).
5. Claims 1-86 are pending in the case. Claims 1, 12, 18, 29, 37, 40, 45, 50, 53, 58, 66, 69, 74, 79, and 82 are independent claims.

Election/Restrictions

6. Newly submitted claims 29-86 are directed to an invention that is independent or distinct from the invention originally claimed for the following reasons: Claims 29-86 (Invention II) are considered related as subcombinations disclosed as usable together in a single combination with regard to pending original claims 1-28 (Invention I). The subcombinations are distinct from each other if they are shown to be separately usable. In the instant case, Invention I has utility for notifying/recording document layout changes classified in 715/517. Invention II has separate utility directed to the management of distributed database data and file access and retrieval (i.e. extracting data from a plurality of data sources), and retrieval and storage (i.e.

summarization/normalization of the plurality of accessed data for storage) of extracted database data from remote sites classified in 707/10.

Since applicant has received an action on the merits for the originally presented invention, this invention has been constructively elected by original presentation for prosecution on the merits. Accordingly, claims 29-86 are withdrawn from consideration as being directed to a non-elected invention. See 37 CFR 1.142(b) and MPEP § 821.03.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 1-2, 12-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Weinberg et al (US-6,360,332 03/19/02).

-In regard to substantially similar independent claims 1 and 12, Weinberg teaches an application for enabling automated notification of applied structural changes to electronic information pages on a network comprising:

an interface for enabling users to build and modify network navigation and interaction templates using functional logic blocks (column 2, lines 25-35; columns 9-10, lines 48-23), for navigating to and interacting with interactive electronic information pages (columns 9-10, lines 48-22: “web site”; column 14, lines 39-41);

a navigation interface for integrating the software application to a proxy-navigation system for periodic execution of the templates (column 2, lines 35-39; column 6, lines 15-19);

a change notification module for indicating a point in process where a navigation and interaction routine has failed and for creating a data file containing parameters associated with the failed routine (column 2, lines 39-40; column 3, lines 29-43; column 6, lines 19-22; column 17, lines 10-52)(Fig. 5F); and

storing the data file (column 2, lines 39-40; column 6, lines 19-22), wherein the application periodically submits test navigation and interaction routines (column 6, lines 19-22), and upon failure of the routine, creates a data file (column 2, lines 39-40; column 3, lines 29-43; column 6, lines 19-22; column 17, lines 10-52)(Fig. 5F), the data file comprising a point-of-failure indication within the failed routine (Fig. 5F: column 17, lines 17-21), an identifier of the associated electronic page (columns 17-18: lines 62-12)(Fig. 5F: “URL: www.mercint.com”), and stores the data file in the data repository sending notification of the action to the developer (column 2, lines 39-40; column 6, lines 15-23).

Weinberg does not specifically teach where the data file was stored in a database. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for Weinberg to have stored the data file in a database, because Weinberg teaches storing the data file for later viewing (column 2, lines 39-40) and it was notoriously well known in the art that any storage of information could be looked upon as a database. In addition it was notoriously well known in the art that databases provided users the benefit of easy access to stored information.

-In regard to dependent claims 2, 13, and 19, Weinberg teaches wherein the network (column 5, line 5) could be the Internet (column 16, lines 9-10) and wherein the electronic information page was a web page (columns 9-10, lines 48-22: "web site"; column 14, lines 39-41) on the network.

-In regard to dependent claim 14, Weinberg teaches wherein the software application was an Internet (column 16, lines 9-10) based application executing and running on a server (Fig. 6C: Transactional Server).

-In regard to dependent claims 15 and 16, Weinberg teaches wherein a single server system hosting both the proxy navigation software and the software application (Fig. 6C: Transactional Server).

-In regard to dependent claim 17, Weinberg teaches wherein software application and the proxy navigation software are integrated as a single application enabling both functions of navigation according to navigation templates and notifying and recoding failed instances of navigation (column 2, lines 26-40).

-In regard to independent claim 18, Weinberg teaches a method for receiving automated notification of random structural changes applied to electronic information pages hosted on a network comprising:

-establishing notification of a failed navigation and interaction routine executed for the purpose of navigating to and interacting with an electronic information page (column 6, lines 15-23; column 17, lines 10-52)(Fig. 5F).

-recording an instance of the failed routine including parameters associated with the cause of failure (column 2, lines 39-40; column 3, lines 29-43; column 6, lines 19-22; column 17, lines 10-52)(Fig. 5F);

-accessing the recorded instance of the failed routine for review purposes (column 2, lines 39-40; column 6, lines 19-22);

-being able to navigate to the electronic information page identified in the recorded instance (i.e. via the stored URL of electronic information page in recorded instance)(columns 17-18, lines 62-12: “web page”; Fig. 5F: “URL: www.mercint.com”);

-accessing source information associated with the electronic information page identified in the recorded instance (i.e. displaying the electronic page reference by the displayed URL (Fig. 5F) via the user browser (column 2, lines 25-30: “interactions between web browser and web server”).

Weinberg does not teach wherein after accessing source information after test routine failure, creating new logic from info in the recorded instance and installing the new logic into an existing navigation template for successful function. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for Weinberg to have performed the above mentioned actions, because Weinberg taught in the background of invention, that it was well known in the art at the time of the invention for the test developer, after test failure, to have to

revise the navigation template (test “script”) so that the test navigation could correct the defect and operate properly (column 1, lines 48-63).

-In regard to dependent claim 20, Weinberg teaches wherein the navigation routine was performed according to a test navigation template (column 2, lines 25-40).

-In regard to dependent claim 21, Weinberg teaches wherein the navigation routine was performed according to a client navigation template (column 2, lines 25-35).

-In regard to dependent claim 22, Weinberg teaches wherein the recorded instance of the failed routine was created in the form of a data file (column 2, lines 39-40; column 3, lines 29-43; column 6, lines 19-22; column 17, lines 10-52)(Fig. 5F) and stored in a data repository (column 2, lines 39-40; column 6, lines 19-22) via the network (column 5, line 5).

-In regard to dependent claim 23, Weinberg teaches wherein the recorded instance of the failed navigation routine was accessed by a software developer (column 2, lines 39-40; column 3, lines 29-43; column 6, lines 15-22)(Fig. 5F).

-In regard to dependent claim 24, Weinberg teaches wherein navigation was performed by the developer utilizing an instance of a browser installed on a computerized workstation (column 2, lines 25-30: “interactions between web browser and web server”; column 5, lines 4-12: “requests from users on a computer network”).

-In regard to dependent claim 25, Weinberg teaches wherein the new logic was in the form of a modular logic block installable to a navigation template (column 5, lines 15-16: "set or related business processes"; column 17, lines 10-34)(Fig. 5F).

-In regard to dependent claim 26, Weinberg teaches wherein the new logic block self-installs to a depended navigation template (column 1, lines 62-63).

-In regard to dependent claim 27, Weinberg teaches testing the new logic before the implementation (column 1, lines 63-65).

-In regard to dependent claim 28, Weinberg teaches creating more than one logic block within a navigation template and wherein more than one block could fail (column 16, lines 26-40). As discussed above, Weinberg teaches wherein it would have been beneficial to correct all the defects of the navigation template (test "script") so that the navigation template would operate properly (column 1, lines 48-64).

9. Claims 3-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Weinberg et al (US-6,360,332 03/19/02) in view of W3C's, "HTML 4.0 Specification," 04/24/98, <http://www.w3.org/TR/1998/REC-html40-19980424/>, pp. 1-27 (Hereafter W3C).

-In regard to dependent claim 3, Weinberg teaches wherein the logic blocks include site logic blocks/portions (column 5, lines 7-21; columns 9-10, lines 48-23: e.g. Text Check, Image

Check, Applet Check). Weinberg does not specifically teach wherein the logic blocks were automated site-login blocks and automated site-registration blocks. W3C teaches that automated site-login blocks and registration blocks were well known in the HTML art at the time of the invention to be text input field elements (pp. 6-9) bound by HTML tags. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention, for the logic blocks of Weinberg to have included login and site registration blocks, because Weinberg taught submitting logic blocks for checking different parameter (i.e. text or number input) input as part of a business process (column 5, lines 7-23; column 15, lines 20-30) to verify that those blocks were valid. As discussed above, W3C taught said logic blocks were notoriously well known in the art at the time of the invention to be common HTML web page input blocks.

-In regard to dependent claim 4, Weinberg teaches wherein the software application was an Internet (column 16, lines 9-10) based application executing and running on a server (Fig. 6C: Transactional Server).

-In regard to dependent claim 5, Weinberg teaches wherein the application was accessible through a network browser (column 2, lines 25-29).

-In regard to dependent claim 6, Weinberg teaches wherein the templates are test routines (column 2, lines 32-40) executed for determining success or failure of the routine (column 3, lines 28-43).

-In regard to dependent claim 7, Weinberg teaches wherein the templates are executable instruction orders containing logic blocks (column 2, lines 48-51; columns 9-10, lines 48-22; column 13, lines 6-8).

-In regard to dependent claim 8, Weinberg teaches wherein the functional logic blocks are modular and self-installable within the templates (column 5, lines 15-16: “set or related business processes”; column 17, lines 10-34)(Fig. 5F).

-In regard to dependent claim 9, Weinberg teaches wherein the data files are human readable (Fig. 5F) and are accessed by developers (column 2, lines 36-40; column 3, lines 29-44; column 6, lines 19-24) for the purpose of affecting updating of the navigation templates (column 1, lines 62-63).

-In regard to dependent claim 10, Weinberg teaches wherein the developers access the application via individual computerized workstations (column 2, lines 25-30: “interactions between web browser and web server”; column 5, lines 4-12: “requests from users on a computer network”).

-In regard to dependent claim 11, Weinberg teaches wherein the error notification and data file are performed in the event failure or a client’s personalized navigation template (column 2, lines 39-40; column 3, lines 29-43; column 6, lines 15-22)(Fig. 5F).

Response to Arguments

10. Applicant's arguments filed 01/06/06 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In regard to independent claims 1, 12, and 18, Applicant argues that the Weinberg reference does not teach or suggest testing for applied structural changes, in that running data checks on text and image changes in web pages do not constitute structural changes. Similarly Applicant argues the difference between the Applicant's error system and that of Weinberg is that Applicant's system is concerned with whether the information can be retrieved at all, and not whether it is the same as expected. The Examiner respectfully disagrees with the Applicant and believes Weinberg teaches said limitations. Weinberg clearly teach detecting structural changes in a web page, where within a user test procedure a user could set certain verification steps such as text, image, and applet checks (column 2, lines 22-40; column 10, lines 12-22). These verification checks determine whether or not tested web pages contain certain text strings, images, or applets. The checks therefore verify that certain data on a web page has remained the same or has changed, and if changed producing an error notification for the user. The Examiner disagrees with the Applicant that items such as text or images do not constitute part of the structure of a web page. In Weinberg if a test requested a specific image on a web page, and said image had been removed, an error notification would be created detailing that said image was unable to be retrieved. Said error notification would be a clear indication that the structure of the web page had changed because the requested image no longer existed at its given location.

The Applicant also argues that while Weinberg teaches a tree structure for displaying results, there is no specific or enabling teaching for indicating a point-in-process where a

navigation and interaction routine has failed. The Examiner respectfully disagrees with the Applicant and believes that the Weinberg reference clearly teaches indicating a point-in-process where a navigation and interaction routine has failed. Weinberg teaches wherein results of the test navigation and interaction routines, including the results of the verification steps were stored for viewing (column 2, lines 39-40). Weinberg also teaches wherein displaying the test results in a hierarchical tree (“report tree”) can also display the results of the verification steps graphically within the report tree, such as displaying a green check mark or a red “X” symbol to indicate pass/fail status (column 3, lines 29-43; column 17, lines 10-52). Thus the Weinberg reference indicates to the user via the report tree the point-in-process has failed by displaying a red “X” symbol in the report tree (Fig. 5F: i.e. Red “X” shows that Test Iteration 4 has failed. The Test Status (90) also shows that the current test status is “Failed”).

The Examiner wishes to note that Applicant’s arguments with respect to the newly added claims initiating an interference with U.S. Application Serial No. 10/040314 are immaterial in that said newly added claims have been restricted (Please note the Election/Restrictions section as detailed above).

Conclusion

11. All claims are drawn to the same invention claimed in the earlier application and could have been finally rejected on the grounds and art of record in the next Office action if they had been entered in the earlier application. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL** even though it is a first action in this case. See MPEP § 706.07(b). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no, however, event will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Adam L. Basehoar whose telephone number is (571)-272-4121. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F: 7:00am - 4:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Steve Hong can be reached on (571) 272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

ALB



STEPHEN HONG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER